Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 000–000 (0000) Printed 5 February 2008 (MN LaTeX style file v2.2)

Lagrangian perturbation theory for rotating magnetic stars

Kostas Glampedakis and Nils Andersson
School of Mathematics, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom

arXiv:astro-ph/0702382v1 14 Feb 2007

5 February 2008

ABSTRACT

Motivated by the possibility of radiation driven instabilities in rotating magnetic stars, we study the stability properties of general linear perturbations of a stationary and axisymmetric, infinitely conducting perfect fluid configuration threaded by a magnetic field and surrounded by vacuum. We develop a Lagrangian perturbation framework which enables us to formulate a strict stability criterion based on the notion of a canonical energy (a functional of the fluid displacement ξ and its first time derivative). For any given choice of $\{\xi, \partial_t \xi\}$, the sign of the canonical energy determines whether the configuration is stable or not at the linear level. Our analysis provides the first complete description of the stability problem for a magnetic star, allowing for both rotation and the presence of a magnetic field in the exterior vacuum region. A key feature of the Lagrangian formulation is the existence of so-called 'trivial' fluid displacements, which do not represent true physical perturbations. In order for the stability criterion to make rigorous sense one has to isolate these trivials and consider only the physical 'canonical' displacements. We discuss this problem and formulate a condition which must be satisfied by all canonical displacements. Having obtained a well-defined stability criterion we provide examples which indicate that the magnetic field has a stabilising effect on radiation driven instabilities.

1 INTRODUCTION

The stability of a hydromagnetic configuration under the influence of linear perturbations is a classic interdisciplinary problem whose relevance ranges from astrophysical systems to terrestrial laboratories. Accordingly, the literature on the subject is vast (see Mestel (2003) for an up-to-date discussion of magnetic astrophysical systems and a rich list of relevant references). The present paper is motivated by the interesting possibility that the emission of radiation may drive various stellar oscillation modes unstable. This class of instabilities has so far only been studied in detail for systems radiating gravitational waves at a significant level (see Andersson (2003) for a review). A very important question concerns to what extent electromagnetic radiation is relevant in this context. To begin addressing this question, we focus on the stability of astrophysical hydromagnetic systems, self-gravitating fluid bodies endowed with both rotation and magnetic fields. Neutron stars are prime examples of such systems, as they are the most rapidly spinning and highly magnetised systems known in the cosmos.

The foundations for the modern stability theory for Newtonian fluid stars were laid by Chandrasekhar more than 50 years ago (see Chandrasekhar (1961) for a summary). A major contribution to the subject was made by Bernstein et al. (1958) who devised a stability criterion, based on the sign of the potential energy, for a static hydromagnetic configuration where the unperturbed magnetic field is tangential at the fluid-vacuum interface. Subsequent work by Frieman & Rotenberg (1960) generalised the analysis to stationary configurations (albeit only for fields that are confined to the fluid). Another key generalisation was provided by Kovetz (1966) who considered the static problem but allowed the magnetic field to extend into the vacuum domain without any restrictions.

For fluid configurations, an important contribution was made by Lynden-Bell & Ostriker (1967). Their stability criterion for a rotating fluid configuration was expressed in terms of an operator which depends on the Lagrangian displacement ξ. Since this operator represents the system's potential energy, this criterion is identical to that of Bernstein et al. (1958). A few years later Friedman & Schutz (1978a) added a crucial element that had been overlooked in the previous analyses. They reformulated the stability criterion in terms of the Lagrangian canonical energy functional $E_c(\xi, \partial_t \xi)$, emphasising the existence of 'trivial' fluid displacements. Even though these trivial displacements produce no physical change in the system, they do change the canonical energy. Consequently, as argued by Friedman & Schutz (1978a), the presence of trivials disables the stability criterion of Lynden-Bell & Ostriker. To avoid this impasse Friedman & Schutz (1978a) identified the family of trivial displacements, and expressed the stability criterion in terms of physical 'canonical' displacements. Since the late 1970s this stability criterion for rotating fluid configurations has been the final word on the topic. A particularly important outcome of the Friedman & Schutz (1978a) work was the discovery of the so-called CFS instability by which *all* rotating perfect fluid stars are secularly unstable due to the emission of gravitational radiation (Friedman & Schutz 1978b; Andersson 2003).

Quite surprisingly, to the best of our knowledge, there has so far been no attempt to modify the stability criteria for magnetic stars along the lines of Friedman & Schutz (1978a). The original Bernstein et al. (1958) criterion is now textbook material (see Mestel (2003)). Yet it is clear that the existence of trivial displacements may *invalidate* the analysis for rotating stars. In fact, since they are characterised by a non-vanishing canonical energy, trivial perturbations (which are totally unphysical) might well be qualified as being unstable. This is troublesome, and highlights the need for the problem to be revisited.

In this paper we aim to provide a rigorous stability criterion for rotating hydromagnetic configurations taking due account of the presence of trivial displacements. We consider a self-gravitating perfect fluid threaded by a magnetic field, assuming a stationary equilibrium and an arbitrary structure for the magnetic field (extendable to the vacuum exterior). This set up combines and generalises previous studies (Bernstein et al. 1958; Frieman & Rotenberg 1960; Kovetz 1966). We determine the conditions that govern the family of trivial displacements and provide explicit conditions that need to be satisfied by physically acceptable canonical perturbations. The required canonical energy functional is also explicitly formulated. Given these results, the hydromagnetic stability criterion can be properly formulated and evaluated for any magnetic field configuration. To illustrate this, we apply the stability criterion to a few simple cases. In particular, we demonstrate that there are always canonical data which make a magnetic rotating star secularly unstable, under the emission of electromagnetic and/or gravitational radiation, in the limit of $m \gg 1$ (assuming that the perturbations depend on the azimuthal angle as $e^{im\varphi}$).

2 LAGRANGIAN PERTURBATION THEORY FOR MAGNETIC STARS

2.1 Formulation

We consider a *stationary*, but otherwise arbitrary, self-gravitating perfect fluid configuration (of compact support, surrounded by vacuum) which is threaded by a magnetic field B^a. The fluid flow is described by the velocity field u^a and furthermore, ideal MHD conditions (i.e. infinite conductivity) and a one-parameter equation of state $p = p(\rho)$ are assumed. We will carry out the analysis in a coordinate basis, distinguishing between co- and contra-variant objects. This may be a somewhat unfamiliar approach to a "standard" Newtonian fluid dynamics problem, but it has significant advantages (see Andersson & Comer (2006) for a recent discussion). Most importantly, it allows us to define Lagrangian perturbations and discuss conservation laws in terms of the Lie derivative. The advantage of this will be clear at various points of our discussion, eg. when we consider the conditions at the surface of the star. As usual in this context spatial indices are raised and lowered with the flat metric g_{ab}, i.e. we have $u_a = g_{ab}u^b$ etcetera.

The coupled fluid-magnetic field system is governed by the familiar Euler and induction equations (denoting the convective derivative by $D/Dt = \partial_t + u^b\nabla_b$),

$$\frac{Du_a}{Dt} + \frac{1}{\rho}\nabla_a\left(p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right) + \nabla_a\Phi - \frac{1}{4\pi\rho}B^b\nabla_b B_a = 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{DB_a}{Dt} = (B^b\nabla_b)u_a - B_a(\nabla_b u^b) \tag{2}$$

together with the continuity equation,

$$\partial_t\rho + \nabla_a(\rho u^a) = 0 \tag{3}$$

and Poisson's equation for the gravitational potential,

$$\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\rho \tag{4}$$

Additional equations are Ohm's law (which determines the electric field within the fluid),

$$E^a = -\frac{1}{c}\,\epsilon^{abc}u_b B_c \tag{5}$$

and, of course, the fact that $\nabla_a B^a = 0$.

The stationary 'background' configuration is obtained from the above system by setting all time derivatives to zero. We wish to consider an arbitrary perturbation of this background configuration. For the perturbative quantities we choose to work in the Lagrangian sense, by means of a displacement vector ξ^a. By definition we know that,

$$\Delta u^a = \partial_t \xi^a \tag{6}$$

For the covariant component we have,

$$\Delta u_a = \partial_t \xi_a + u^b \nabla_b \xi_a + u^b \nabla_a \xi_b \tag{7}$$

where we have used

$$\Delta g_{ab} = \nabla_a \xi_b + \nabla_b \xi_a \tag{8}$$

For an arbitrary tensor Q (suppressing indices) we have the general expression, (Friedman & Schutz 1978a),

$$\Delta Q = \delta Q + \mathcal{L}_\xi Q \tag{9}$$

relating Lagrangian and Eulerian perturbations. For a scalar quantity ρ the Lie derivative is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi \rho = \xi^a \nabla_a \rho \tag{10}$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi u_a = \xi^b \nabla_b u_a + u_b \nabla_a \xi^b \tag{11}$$

and

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi u^a = \xi^b \nabla_b u^a - u^b \nabla_b \xi^a \tag{12}$$

for co- and contravariant vectors.

Our first task is to express $\Delta\rho,\ \Delta p,\ \Delta B^a$ in terms of the displacement ξ^a. From conservation of mass and the equation of state we readily find (Friedman & Schutz 1978a),

$$\Delta\rho = -\rho \nabla_a \xi^a, \qquad \Delta p = \frac{\gamma p}{\rho} \Delta\rho \tag{13}$$

where $\gamma = (\rho/p)(\partial p/\partial\rho)$ is the adiabatic index.

In order to find ΔB^a we can perturb the induction equation (2). The procedure becomes more elegant if we first rewrite this equation (with the help of eqn. (3)) using the Lie-derivative,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u] \left(\frac{B^a}{\rho} \right) = 0 \tag{14}$$

This relation shows that B^a/ρ is preserved along the flow u^a. This encodes the expectation that the field lines are 'frozen into' the fluid. An attractive feature of (14) is that the Δ and $[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]$ operators commute. Hence, we immediately have

$$[\,\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u\,]\, \Delta \left(\frac{B^a}{\rho} \right) = 0 \tag{15}$$

In other words, the Lagrangian perturbation of B^a/ρ is also *Lie-transported* by the flow. It is natural to assume that the initial configuration is unperturbed, i.e. to choose the trivial solution[1] $\Delta(B^a/\rho) = 0$ to (15). This then leads to

$$\Delta B^b = -B^b \nabla_c \xi^c \tag{16}$$

From this we readily obtain,

$$\Delta B_a = \Delta g_{ab} B^b + g_{ab} \Delta B^b \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Delta B_a = B_b \nabla_a \xi^b - B_a \nabla_b \xi^b + B^b \nabla_b \xi_a \tag{17}$$

The corresponding Eulerian perturbation of the magnetic field is given by

$$b^a \equiv \delta B^a = \Delta B^a - \mathcal{L}_\xi B^a \quad \Rightarrow \quad b^a = -B^a(\nabla_b \xi^b) - (\xi^b \nabla_b) B^a + (B^b \nabla_b) \xi^a \tag{18}$$

This is equivalent to (Roberts 1967),

$$b^a = \epsilon^{abc} \nabla_b \left(\epsilon_{cde} \xi^d B^e \right) \tag{19}$$

where ϵ^{abc} is the familiar three-dimensional Levi-Civita symbol. Note the useful identity,

$$\epsilon^{abc} \epsilon_{ade} = \delta^b_d \delta^c_e - \delta^b_e \delta^c_d \tag{20}$$

---

[1] It is worth noting that this choice ensures that the Eulerian perturbation of the induction equation (2) vanishes automatically, as required for an unconstrained variational formalism, see the discussion in Friedman & Schutz (1978a).

2.2 Master equation

We now have all the tools required to derive a ‘master’ perturbation equation involving only the displacement vector ξ^a. This can be achieved by considering the Lagrangian perturbation of the Euler equation (1). With the help of the background equations and after some rearrangement we end up with

$$\rho\,\partial_t^2\xi_a + 2\rho u^b\nabla_b\partial_t\xi_a + \rho(u^b\nabla_b)^2\xi_a + \delta\rho(\,\nabla_a\Phi + u^c\nabla_c u_a\,) + \rho\nabla_a\delta\Phi + \nabla_a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right)$$
$$-\frac{1}{4\pi}(\,b^c\nabla_c B_a + B^c\nabla_c b_a\,) - \rho\xi^c\nabla_c(u^b\nabla_b u_a) = 0 \qquad (21)$$

This equation is of the form,

$$A[\partial_t^2\xi_a] + B[\partial_t\xi_a] + C[\xi_a] = 0 \qquad (22)$$

where A, B, C are operators constructed from background variables. The first two are identical to the operators appearing in the non-magnetic limit and, as shown by Friedman & Schutz (1978a), they are respectively Hermitian and anti-Hermitian with respect to the inner product,

$$\langle\,\eta^a, \xi_a\,\rangle \equiv \int (\eta^a)^*\xi_a dV \qquad (23)$$

The integral is taken over the space occupied by the fluid and the asterisk denotes complex a conjugate. That is, we have

$$\langle\,\eta, A[\xi]\,\rangle = \langle\,\xi, A[\eta]\,\rangle^*, \qquad \langle\,\eta, B[\xi]\,\rangle = -\langle\,\xi, B[\eta]\,\rangle^* \qquad (24)$$

where both η^a and ξ^a are solutions of eqn. (22). Following Friedman & Schutz (1978a) we can construct the ‘symplectic’ product,

$$W(\eta,\xi) = \langle\,\eta, \Pi(\xi)\,\rangle - \langle\,\Pi(\eta), \xi\,\rangle \qquad (25)$$

where we have introduced the conjugate canonical momentum,

$$\Pi(\xi) = A[\partial_t\xi] + \frac{1}{2}B[\xi] = \rho\frac{D\xi}{Dt} \qquad (26)$$

Then it follows (using eqns. (22) and (24)) that,

$$\partial_t W(\eta,\xi) = \langle\,C[\eta], \xi\,\rangle - \langle\,\eta, C[\xi]\,\rangle \qquad (27)$$

This shows that, *provided* that the operator C is Hermitian, $W(\eta,\xi)$ is a *conserved* quantity. This is true for the non-magnetic case (Friedman & Schutz 1978a), and we can show that it remains true for the magnetic case as well.

The proof of the Hermiticity of the C operator is somewhat lengthy. In order to avoid overloading the reader with algebra at this point, we relegate this calculation to Appendix A. The final result is, cf. Eq. (A15),

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^a C[\xi_a] \quad = \quad & \nabla_a\left[\eta^a(\delta p + B^c b_c/4\pi) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^c(B^a b_c + B^a\xi^b\nabla_b B_c) + \rho\eta^b u^a u^c\nabla_c\xi_b + \delta_\xi\Phi\left(\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^a\delta_\eta\Phi + \rho\eta^a\right)\right]\\ & -\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^b\delta_\eta\Phi\nabla_b\delta_\xi\Phi + \frac{1}{4\pi}B^b B^c\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a + \eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b(p + B^2/8\pi) + \nabla_a\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b[\gamma p + B^2/4\pi]\\ & +\frac{1}{4\pi}\left[\nabla_a\eta^a B^c(\xi^b\nabla_c B_b - \nabla_c\xi^b B_b) + \nabla_b\xi^b B^c(\eta^a\nabla_c B_a - \nabla_c\eta^a B_a)\right]\\ & -\rho(u^c\nabla_c u_a + \nabla_a\Phi)(\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b + \xi^a\nabla_b\eta^b) + \rho\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b\Phi - \rho u^c u^b\nabla_b\eta^a\nabla_c\xi_a \end{aligned} \qquad (28)$$

The fact that η^a and ξ^a appear in a symmetric way proves that the operator C is Hermitian, *modulo* the surface terms (resulting from the total divergence in the first line of (28)). To discuss these remaining terms we write the result as,

$$\eta^a C[\xi_a] = \eta^a C_{\rm H}[\xi_a] + \nabla_a S^a_{\rm M} + \nabla_a S^a_{\rm F} \qquad (29)$$

where $C_{\rm H}$ is Hermitian and the surface terms are given by,

$$S^a_{\rm F}(\eta,\xi) \quad \equiv \quad \rho\eta^b u^a u^c\nabla_c\xi_b + \delta_\xi\Phi\left(\frac{1}{4\pi G}g^{ab}\nabla_b\delta_\eta\Phi + \rho\eta^a\right) \qquad (30)$$

$$S^a_{\rm M}(\eta,\xi) \quad \equiv \quad \eta^a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}B^c b_c\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^c\left(B^a b_c + B^a\xi^b\nabla_b B_c\right) \qquad (31)$$

In the $B \to 0$ limit eqn. (29) reduces to the result of Friedman & Schutz (1978a). In this case the fluid surface terms vanish identically since we have $\rho = p = \nabla p = 0$ and $\Delta p = 0$ at the surface. The remaining gravitational term $g^{ab}\delta_\xi\Phi\nabla_b\delta_\eta\Phi$ can be shown to be Hermitian, see Andersson, Comer & Grosart (2004), rendering the full C Hermitian. Using the same arguments it follows that the $S_{\rm F}$ term is Hermitian also when the magnetic field is present. The remaining surface term $S^a_{\rm M}$ is, however, generically non zero. This is easy to appreciate since the magnetic pressure does not have to vanish at the fluid surface. A simple way to avoid problems would be to assume that the surface terms vanish anyway, e.g. by only considering magnetic fields that are confined to the fluid. This is, however, a severe and not very realistic restriction. Instead, we will consider the general problem and prove that the remaining surface terms are Hermitian. This requires further manipulation and a detailed discussion of the appropriate boundary conditions that need to be satisfied at the fluid/vacuum interface.

2.3 Surface boundary conditions

Since we are interested in studying general systems which have a fluid-vacuum interface, we need to consider the relevant boundary conditions at such a surface. In order to work out these conditions we first consider the normal vector to the surface and how it is affected by a Lagrangian perturbation. The Lie derivative plays a key role in this analysis and simplifies the problem considerably, (compared to, for example, the analysis in Roberts (1967)). Let us identify the surface as a level set of a scalar function f. In the fluid it would be natural to identify this function with the fluid pressure, but we also assume that the function can be extended to the exterior domain in a smooth fashion (this extension facilitates the definition of derivatives of f). We then require,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\, f = 0 \tag{32}$$

from which it is easy to show that,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\nabla_a f = 0 \tag{33}$$

In other words, the gradient $\nabla_a f$ is constant in the fluid frame. We also see that we must have,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\Delta f = 0 \tag{34}$$

The trivial solution to this equation is $\Delta f = 0$, which essentially means that a fluid element at the original surface remains at the perturbed surface. The normal to the surface can obviously be taken to be $n_a = \nabla_a f$, from which a unit normal vector can be constructed,

$$\hat{n}_a = \frac{\nabla_a f}{N}, \quad \text{where} \quad N = (g^{ab}\nabla_a f \nabla_b f)^{1/2} \tag{35}$$

Given the above results, it is straightforward to show that

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\hat{n}_a = -\frac{\hat{n}_a}{N}[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]N \tag{36}$$

This shows that any change to the unit normal is parallel to the normal itself. Hence the orthogonal projection (into the surface) is conserved by the flow. This leads to,

$$\frac{D\hat{n}^a}{Dt} = (\hat{n}^a\hat{n}^b - g^{ab})\hat{n}^c\nabla_b u_c \tag{37}$$

which is the equation for the normal vector given by, for example, Kovetz (1966). Perturbing this equation leads to,

$$\Delta\hat{n}_a = \hat{n}_a\hat{n}_c\hat{n}^b\nabla_b\xi^c \tag{38}$$

In deriving this we have assumed that the background configuration is such that $\hat{n}^a u_a = 0$, that is, there is no local expansion or contraction. Equation (38) highlights a key difference between the normal vectors $\hat{n}_a$ and n_a, since for the latter we have from (33),

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\Delta n_a = 0 \tag{39}$$

It is natural to use the trivial solution

$$\Delta n_a = 0 \tag{40}$$

for fluid elements on the surface. Then it immediately follows that

$$g^{ab}\Delta n_b = \Delta n^a + n^c\nabla_c\xi^a + g^{ab}n^c\nabla_b\,\xi_c = 0 \tag{41}$$

That is,

$$\Delta n^a = -n^c\nabla_c\xi^a - g^{ab}n^c\nabla_b\,\xi_c \tag{42}$$

Having a mathematical representation of the perturbed surface at hand, we can move on to the surface condition for the magnetic and electric fields. The general conditions can be found in standard textbooks, see for example, Roberts (1967). In describing them we will use angular brackets to represent the step in a quantity as we pass from the fluid to the exterior. That is, for any quantity Q we define,

$$\langle Q\rangle \equiv Q^{\mathrm{x}} - Q \tag{43}$$

where the index 'x' designates an exterior vacuum quantity. The brackets denoting a jump across the boundary should not be confused with the brackets used in the definition of the inner product (23). One can easily avoid mixing things up by keeping in mind that the symplectic product takes two arguments.

From the fact that B^a is divergence-free we immediately obtain,

$$\hat{n}^a \langle\, B_a \,\rangle = 0 \tag{44}$$

Meanwhile, the Maxwell equation $\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b E_c = -(1/c)\partial_t B^a$ leads to,

$$\epsilon^{abc}\hat{n}_b \langle\, E_c \,\rangle = \frac{1}{c}(\hat{n}^b u_b)\langle\, B^a \,\rangle \tag{45}$$

The surface conditions (44) and (45) are originally formulated in terms of the unit normal vector $\hat{n}^a$. However in view of the previous results (eqns. (38) and (40)) the forthcoming analysis is greatly simplified if we rewrite[2] the surface conditions in terms of $n^a = N\hat{n}^a$. Subsequently taking the Lagrangian variation of (45), and using the fact that $n_a u^a = 0$ for the background, as well as eqn. (40), we find

$$c\,\hat{n}_b \Delta(\epsilon^{abc}\langle\, E_c \,\rangle) = \hat{n}_b \partial_t \xi^b \langle\, B^a \,\rangle \tag{46}$$

Use of the background equation (5) for the interior electric field together with eqn. (16) allows us to show that

$$\Delta(\epsilon^{abc}E_c) = -\frac{1}{c}\left[(\partial_t\xi^a B^b - \partial_t \xi^b B^a) + (u^b B^a - u^a B^b)\nabla_c \xi^c\right] \tag{47}$$

For the exterior electric field we have

$$\Delta(\epsilon^{abc}E_c^{\rm x}) = -\epsilon^{abc}E_c^{\rm x}\nabla_k \xi^k + \epsilon^{abc}\Delta E_c^{\rm x} \tag{48}$$

where we have used (Friedman & Schutz 1978a),

$$\Delta \epsilon^{abc} = -\epsilon^{abc}\,\nabla_k \xi^k \tag{49}$$

Given these relations, eqn. (46) becomes

$$c\,\epsilon^{abc}\hat{n}_b \Delta E_c^{\rm x} = \hat{n}_k(\partial_t \xi^k B_{\rm x}^a - B^k \partial_t \xi^a) + u^a \hat{n}_b B^b \nabla_k \xi^k \tag{50}$$

where we have used (for the background)

$$\epsilon^{abc}\hat{n}_b E_c^{\rm x} = 0 \tag{51}$$

which follows from (45).

Finally, it is useful to express the exterior electric field in terms of the vector potential A^k,

$$E_k^{\rm x} = -\frac{1}{c}\partial_t A_k \tag{52}$$

Perturbing this we find

$$\Delta E_k^{\rm x} = -\frac{1}{c}\partial_t(\Delta A_k - \mathcal{L}_\xi A_k) = -\frac{1}{c}\partial_t \delta A_k \equiv -\frac{1}{c}\partial_t \mathcal{A}_k \tag{53}$$

where we have used the fact that the background is stationary. This leads to the final form for the required boundary condition

$$\hat{n}_b \partial_t \xi^b B_{\rm x}^a - \hat{n}_b B^b \partial_t \xi^a + \epsilon^{abc}\hat{n}_b \partial_t \mathcal{A}_c = 0 \tag{54}$$

This relation is a total time derivative which upon integration gives

$$\hat{n}_b \xi^b B_{\rm x}^a - \hat{n}_b B^b \xi^a + \epsilon^{abc}\hat{n}_b \mathcal{A}_c = 0 \tag{55}$$

This is identical to the condition derived by Kovetz (1966) in the case of a *static* background configuration.

An additional interface condition that needs to be satisfied is the continuity of the normal component of the fluid-magnetic field stress tensor,

$$\langle\, T_{ab}\hat{n}^b \,\rangle = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad T_{ab} = -g_{ab}\left(p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right) + \frac{1}{4\pi}B_a B_b \tag{56}$$

Explicitly,

$$\hat{n}_a \left\langle\, p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \,\right\rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi}(\hat{n}_c B^c)\langle\, B_a \,\rangle \tag{57}$$

---

[2] Another way of seeing that the perturbed norm of the normal vector does not affect the result is to note that, when we perturb (45) then ΔN will multiply a quantity that vanishes since the boundary conditions also hold for the background.

Projecting this along $\hat{n}^a$ and using (44) we obtain,

$$\left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle = 0 \tag{58}$$

and

$$(\hat{n}^b B_b)\langle B_a \rangle = 0 \tag{59}$$

Lagrangian variation of these conditions (replacing $\hat{n}^a$ with n^a in (59), as before) results in,

$$\Delta p = \frac{1}{4\pi}\left(B^{\rm x}_c b^c_{\rm x} + B^{\rm x}_c \xi^b \nabla_b B^c_{\rm x} - B_c b^c + B_c \xi^b \nabla_b B^c \right) \tag{60}$$

and

$$\hat{n}_c B^c \left(b^a - b^a_{\rm x} - \xi^b \nabla_b \langle B^a \rangle \right) = 0 \tag{61}$$

It is worth emphasising that we are assuming that ideal MHD can be used throughout our system. This assumption will not be valid for a realistic neutron star model since the Alfvén velocity will diverge near the fluid surface, as $\rho \to 0$. A detailed analysis of the surface region would require the introduction of a transition region from ideal MHD conditions in the core of the star to the full Maxwell equations in the exterior vacuum. Such an analysis is, however, much more intricate than our slightly inconsistent approach. Once the stability problem has been completely understood within the present framework, it would be interesting to extend the analysis to a more detailed surface/vacuum model.

2.4 Magnetic surface term

Returning to eqn. (29), our immediate objective is to eliminate, or symmetrise $S_{\rm M}$, thus rendering the operator C Hermitian. The following steps closely resemble the calculation by Kovetz (1966).

For convenience we split $S_{\rm M}$ into two pieces: $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\rm M} = S_1 + S_2$ with,

$$S_1 = \nabla_a \left[\eta^a \left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi} B^c b_c \right) \right] \tag{62}$$

$$S_2 = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \nabla_a \left[B^a \eta^c (b_c + \xi^b \nabla_b B_c) \right] \tag{63}$$

We write $\delta p = \Delta p - \xi^b \nabla_b p$, which with the help of eqns. (60) and (62) leads to

$$S_1 = \nabla_a \left[\eta^a \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} B^x_c b^c_x + \xi^b \nabla_b \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle \right) \right] \tag{64}$$

Since eqn. (58) is uniformly valid everywhere at the fluid-vacuum interface we have

$$\epsilon^{abc} \hat{n}_b \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle = 0 \tag{65}$$

The cross product of this vector with ξ^a is also zero, which leads to

$$\hat{n}_a \xi^b \nabla_b \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle = \hat{n}_b \xi^b \nabla_a \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle \tag{66}$$

Hence,

$$I_1(\eta, \xi) \equiv \int dV S_1 = \int dS \left(\hat{n}_a \hat{n}_b \eta^a \xi^b \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \rangle + \frac{1}{4\pi} \hat{n}_a \eta^a B^x_c b^c_{\rm x} \right) \tag{67}$$

where the integral is taken over the space occupied by the fluid. We can now utilise condition (55) to obtain,

$$I_1 = \int dS \left(\hat{n}_a \hat{n}_b \eta^a \xi^b \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle + \frac{1}{4\pi} \hat{n}_b B^b \eta_c b^c_{\rm x} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon_{cmk} \hat{n}^m \mathcal{A}^k b^c_{\rm x} \right) \tag{68}$$

In this expression the first term is symmetric with respect to η and ξ while the third term involves only exterior fields.

Turning to the second surface term S_2 we have,

$$I_2(\eta, \xi) \equiv \int dV S_2 = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \int dS \hat{n}_a B^a \eta^c \left(b_c + \xi^b \nabla_b B_c \right) \tag{69}$$

Adding both integrals,

$$I_1 + I_2 = \int dS \left[\hat{n}_a \hat{n}_b \eta^a \xi^b \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon_{cmk} \hat{n}^m \mathcal{A}^k b^c_x + \frac{1}{4\pi} \hat{n}_a B^a \eta_c \left(b^c_{\rm x} - b^c - \xi^b \nabla_b B^c \right) \right]$$

$$= \int dS \left[\hat{n}_a \hat{n}_b \eta^a \xi^b \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{4\pi} \epsilon_{cmk} \hat{n}^m \mathcal{A}^k b^c_{\mathrm{x}} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \hat{n}_a B^a \eta^c \xi^b \nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c \right] \tag{70}$$

where we have used eqn. (61).

Noting that $\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c = 0 \Rightarrow \nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c = \nabla_c B^{\mathrm{x}}_b$ we can symmetrise the third term,

$$\eta^c \xi^b \nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c = \frac{1}{2} \eta^c \xi^b (\nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c + \nabla_c B^{\mathrm{x}}_b) \tag{71}$$

Finally, we can manipulate the 'exterior' second term,

$$\int dS\, \hat{n}_m \epsilon^{cmk} \mathcal{A}_k b^{\mathrm{x}}_c = \int_{\mathrm{x}} dV\, \nabla_m \left(\epsilon^{mkc} \mathcal{A}_k b^{\mathrm{x}}_c \right) = \int_{\mathrm{x}} dV \left(b^2_{\mathrm{x}} - \mathcal{A}_k \epsilon^{kmc} \nabla_m b^{\mathrm{x}}_c \right) \tag{72}$$

Note that the integration in the former two expressions is taken over the *exterior* vacuum. Since we generally assume $\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b B_c = 0$ in the exterior the second term in (72) vanishes. It it worth noting that Kovetz (1966) makes the same assumption. This is, of course, a simplification since it means that we are not allowing electromagnetic waves. While this is consistent with our approximate treatment of the surface, it would obviously be interesting to relax these constraints in a future analysis. The natural strategy for such a study would be to follow the work of Friedman (1978) who analyses the non-magnetic problem in full general relativity. The magnetic problem ought to be quite similar, with electromagnetic waves incorporated essentially in the same way as gravitational waves.

Collecting the above results, we arrive at

$$I_{\mathrm{M}}(\eta,\xi) \equiv I_1 + I_2 = \int dS \left[\hat{n}_a \hat{n}_b \eta^a \xi^b \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{8\pi} (\hat{n}_a B^a) \eta^c \xi^b (\nabla_b B^{\mathrm{x}}_c + \nabla_c B^{\mathrm{x}}_b) \right] + \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\mathrm{x}} dV b^2_x \tag{73}$$

and clearly, $I_{\mathrm{M}}(\eta,\xi) = I_{\mathrm{M}}(\xi,\eta)$.

Hence we have proven that the remaining magnetic surface term in (29) is Hermitian

$$\int dV \nabla_a S^a_{\mathrm{M}}(\eta,\xi) = \int dV \nabla_a S^a_{\mathrm{M}}(\xi,\eta) \tag{74}$$

This concludes the proof that the entire C operator in (22) is Hermitian in the magnetic problem. It then follows from eqn. (27) that the symplectic product $W(\eta,\xi)$ is a conserved quantity.

3 CANONICAL ENERGY AND ANGULAR MOMENTUM FOR MAGNETIC STARS

As discussed by Friedman & Schutz (1978a), the symplectic product W can be used to define the system's canonical energy,

$$E_c(\xi) \equiv \frac{1}{2} W(\partial_t \xi, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \langle\, \partial_t \xi, A[\xi]\, \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle\, \xi, C[\xi]\, \rangle \tag{75}$$

Written explicitly,

$$E_c(\xi) = \frac{1}{2} \int dV \left(\rho |\partial_t \xi|^2 + (\xi^a)^* C_{\mathrm{H}}[\xi_a] \right) + I_{\mathrm{M}}(\xi^*, \xi) \tag{76}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} E_c(\xi) \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{2} \int dV \left\{ \rho |\partial_t \xi|^2 - \rho |u^a \nabla_a \xi|^2 + \left(\gamma p + \frac{B^2}{4\pi} \right) |\nabla_a \xi^a|^2 + (\xi^a)^* \xi^b \left[\rho \nabla_a \nabla_b \Phi + \nabla_a \nabla_b \left(p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right) \right] \right. \\ - \quad & 2\rho Re[(\xi^a)^* \nabla_b \xi^b] \{ u^c \nabla_c u_a + \nabla_a \Phi \} + \frac{1}{4\pi} |B^a \nabla_a \xi|^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi} B^c Re \left\{ \nabla_a (\xi^a)^* (\xi^b \nabla_c B_b - B_b \nabla_c \xi^b) \right\} \\ - \quad & \left. \frac{1}{4\pi G} |\nabla \delta \Phi|^2 \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \int dS \left[|\hat{n}^a \xi_a|^2 \hat{n}^c \nabla_c \left\langle p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} \right\rangle - \frac{1}{8\pi} (\hat{n}^a B_a) (\xi^c)^* \xi^b (\nabla_b B^x_c + \nabla_c B^x_b) \right] \\ + \quad & \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_{\mathrm{x}} dV b^2_x \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

A conserved canonical angular momentum J_c can be defined in a similar fashion. We have

$$J_c \equiv -\frac{1}{2} W(\partial_\varphi \xi, \xi) = -Re \langle \partial_\varphi, \Pi(\xi) \rangle \tag{78}$$

which is identical (as a functional) to the angular momentum expression of the non-magnetic problem (Friedman & Schutz 1978a). This is not surprising, since J_c does not depend on the C operator.

It is useful to compare our result for E_c to the corresponding expression for the non-magnetic problem. The latter is simply obtained by setting $B^i = 0$ in the above equations. We see that, in the magnetic case the canonical energy receives contributions from the fluid interior, the vacuum exterior and the fluid-vacuum interface. This makes sense as this energy accounts for both fluid and magnetic-field degrees of freedom and the latter extend beyond the fluid body.

The canonical energy functional plays a central role in the formulation of a stability criterion for a fluid configuration coupled to a radiative field. In its original form the criterion states that the configuration is stable if $E_c(\xi) > 0$ for *all* initial data (Bernstein et al. 1958; Lynden-Bell & Ostriker 1967; Friedman & Schutz 1978b). In order for the system to be dynamically unstable we must have $E_c(\xi) = 0$, and if $E_c(\xi) < 0$ for *any* nonaxisymmetric data, then the configuration is secularly unstable. Intuitively, this criterion makes sense since the emitted radiation causes $\partial_t E_c < 0$ invariantly. A perturbation which initially has negative canonical energy has the capability of growing in time while further decreasing its canonical energy. From our expression for the canonical energy (77) we learn that some of the terms associated with the magnetic degrees of freedom are positive definite, and thus act to stabilise the system. At the same time, there are magnetic contributions to E_c which are indefinite and which may (depending on the field configuration and the displacement vector) stimulate the onset of an instability. However, it would be premature to draw any conclusions about stability at this point. The above criterion is incomplete. Before applying it we must ensure that the displacements we use correspond to a true physical perturbation.

4 TRIVIAL DISPLACEMENTS

An important (and complicating) property of the Lagrangian perturbation theory for a fluid system is the existence of a 'gauge' freedom associated with the displacement vector ξ^a. As first discussed by Friedman & Schutz (1978a), the theory admits a class of *trivial* displacements η^a which correspond to vanishing Eulerian perturbations for all dynamical variables. Although the trivial displacements are unphysical they can have significant impact on the energy stability criterion (Friedman & Schutz 1978a). This is a consequence of the fact that trivial displacements[3] are associated with a nonvanishing E_c. If we take any two displacements ξ_1 and ξ_2 that differ by a trivial, i.e $\xi_2^a = \xi_1^a + \eta^a$, they obviously describe identical physical perturbations. Yet, $E_c(\xi_1 + \eta) \neq E_c(\xi_2)$ and it is easy to see how this could invalidate any stability conclusions drawn from the canonical energy.

In order to make sense, the stability criterion must be reformulated in terms of 'canonical' displacements $\hat{\xi}$ which should have the property $E_c(\hat{\xi} + \eta) = E_c(\hat{\xi})$. The family of canonicals is formally singled out by the requirement of orthogonality with respect to the product W,

$$W(\hat{\xi}, \eta) = 0, \quad \text{for all trivials } \eta \tag{79}$$

It follows that if the canonicals $\hat{\xi}_1$ and $\hat{\xi}_2$ describe the same physical perturbation then $\eta = \hat{\xi}_2 - \hat{\xi}_1$ is a trivial and since both $\hat{\xi}_1$ and $\hat{\xi}_2$ are orthogonal to all trivials, any trivial is itself orthogonal to all trivials, $W(\eta, \eta) = 0$. Then clearly,

$$E_c(\hat{\xi}_2) = \frac{1}{2} W(\partial_t \hat{\xi}_2, \hat{\xi}_2) = \frac{1}{2} W(\partial_t \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_1) + \frac{1}{2} W(\partial_t \eta, \eta) + W(\partial_t \hat{\xi}_1, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} W(\partial_t \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_1) = E_c(\hat{\xi}_1) \tag{80}$$

Now that we understand the nature of the problem, it is clear that we need to investigate the class of trivial displacements permitted in the magnetic problem.

The general definition (79) leads to an explicit condition satisfied by every canonical displacement. In order to derive this condition we first need a solution for the trivials. In the fluid problem, the trivial diplacements η^a are defined by the requirement $\delta\rho = \delta u^a = 0$ which means,

$$\nabla_a (\rho \eta^a) = 0 \tag{81}$$

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u] \eta^a = 0 \tag{82}$$

When a magnetic field is present we also require $b^a = 0$ which provides one additional equation

$$\epsilon^{abc} \nabla_b \left(\epsilon_{cde} \eta^d B^e \right) = 0 \tag{83}$$

The remaining perturbations δp and δE^a vanish as a consequence of the equation of state $p = p(\rho)$ and eqn. (5), respectively. Note that according to (82) trivial displacements are always Lie-transported by the background flow. In fact, the relation (82) can be used to show that

$$W(\hat{\xi}, \eta) = \int dV \rho \eta^a \, \Delta_{\hat{\xi}} u_a = 0 \tag{84}$$

Before moving on to the magnetic problem, it is useful to recall what happens for a non-magnetic fluid. Ignoring (83), the solution of (81) and (82) is (Friedman & Schutz 1978a)

---

[3] Note that for any trivial displacement $E_c(\eta) = 0$, provided the background configuration is *static* (see Appendix A of Friedman & Schutz (1978a)). In this case there is no issue of gauge dependence for the canonical energy.

$$\eta^a = \frac{1}{\rho}\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b \zeta_c \tag{85}$$

where the vector field ζ_c is *arbitrary*, as long as it is Lie-transported along the background flow,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\zeta_a = 0 \tag{86}$$

This last result follows directly from $\delta u^a = 0$ and the identity

$$\mathcal{L}_u(\nabla_a F_b) = \nabla_a(\mathcal{L}_u F_b) - F_c \nabla_a \nabla_b u^c \tag{87}$$

Using (85) in (84) we obtain,

$$\int dV\, \epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b(\Delta_{\hat{\xi}} u_a)\, \zeta_c = 0 \tag{88}$$

Since ζ_c is arbitrary, the above condition is satisfied if

$$\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b(\Delta_{\hat{\xi}} u_c) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Delta_{\hat{\xi}}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b u_c\right) = 0 \tag{89}$$

The vector appearing in the last expression is the fluid's specific vorticity $\omega^a/\rho = \epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b u_c/\rho$. Originally derived by Friedman & Schutz (1978a), expression (89) is the general condition which should be satisfied by all canonical displacements. It states that a canonical displacement must preserve the vorticity of each fluid element.

A different aspect of the same result can be revealed by taking the curl of the non-magnetic Euler equation (1). This leads to the familiar vorticity equation,

$$\frac{D\omega^a}{Dt} = \omega^b \nabla_b u^a - \omega^a \nabla_b u^b \tag{90}$$

This is easily written as,

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\left(\frac{\omega^a}{\rho}\right) = 0 \tag{91}$$

which shows that the specific vorticity vector is Lie-transported. Perturbing (91),

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\Delta\left(\frac{\omega^a}{\rho}\right) = 0 \tag{92}$$

Combining this general result with (89) we see that the canonical displacements single out the the trivial solution $\Delta(\omega^a/\rho) = 0$ of eqn. (92).

Finally, it is interesting to note that eqn. (92) can also be derived from $\partial_t W(\xi, \eta) = 0$ (where now ξ is not necessarily canonical). Starting from (84) we can show that,

$$W(\xi, \eta) = \int dV \zeta_c \rho \Delta\left(\frac{\omega^c}{\rho}\right) \tag{93}$$

Taking the time derivative of this expression and making use of (86) we find

$$\partial_t W(\xi, \eta) = \int dV \zeta_c \rho\, [\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\Delta\left(\frac{\omega^c}{\rho}\right) = 0 \tag{94}$$

Since ζ_c is arbitrary we end up with eqn. (92).

Having arrived at the condition for a canonical displacement, we still face the issue of how to determine such displacements in practice. For later convenience, we note that

$$\Delta_{\hat{\xi}} u_a = \nabla_a f \tag{95}$$

where f an arbitrary scalar function, is always canonical [4]. Indeed,

$$W[\hat{\xi}, \eta] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \int dV \nabla_a(\rho\eta^a) f = 0 \tag{96}$$

is identically satisfied due to (81).

Moving on to the magnetic problem, let us first provide an indication that it may be somewhat challenging. It is easy to see that the trivial form (85) with a general ζ_i cannot possibly be valid in the magnetic case. Indeed, if it were to remain true we could reproduce the derivation of (92). However, in the MHD framework eqn. (91) is replaced by a more complicated relation,

---

[4] This can be immediately verified from (89) for a non-magnetic fluid, and the same is true for the case of a non-isentropic fluid (Friedman & Schutz 1978a).

$$[\partial_t + \mathcal{L}_u]\left(\frac{\omega^a}{\rho}\right) = \frac{1}{4\pi\rho}M^a \tag{97}$$

with

$$M^a = \epsilon^{abc}\, B^k \nabla_b B_k\, \nabla_c(1/\rho) + \epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b\left(\frac{1}{\rho}B^k\, \nabla_k B_c\right) \tag{98}$$

Since the right-hand side of this equation is non-vanishing, we see that the specific vorticity is not conserved in MHD. In fact, as far as we are aware, no corresponding conservation law is known. It is easy to see that this may complicate the analysis of the canonical displacements.

The equations that need to be solved in order to identify the class of trivial displacements are (81) and (83). Since the general solution to the first of these equations is already known from the fluid problem we 'only' need to solve the magnetic equation and then link the two solutions in the appropriate way. First note that the general solution to (83) can be written

$$\epsilon_{cde}\eta^d B^e = \nabla_c\psi \tag{99}$$

where ψ is an arbitrary scalar function[5]. This equation shows that

$$\eta^a\nabla_a\psi = B^a\nabla_a\psi = 0 \tag{100}$$

In other words, both the trivial displacement and the magnetic field lie in surfaces of constant ψ. Taking the cross product of (99) with B^a we obtain

$$B^2\eta^a - (\eta^b B_b)B^a = \epsilon^{abc}B_b\nabla_c\psi \tag{101}$$

Given this, it is easy to show that if we decompose the trivial into $\eta^a = \eta^a_\parallel + \eta^a_\perp$, where $\eta^a_\parallel$ and $\eta^a_\perp$ are respectively parallel and orthogonal to B^a, then

$$\eta^a_\perp = \frac{1}{B^2}\epsilon^{abc}B_b\nabla_c\psi \tag{102}$$

We cannot, however, say anything about the parallel component at this point. Representing it by a scalar function α, we have

$$\eta^a = \alpha B^a + \frac{1}{B^2}\epsilon^{abc}B_b\nabla_c\psi \tag{103}$$

This expression must also satisfy the fluid trivial condition (81). This leads to a relation between α and ψ,

$$B^a\nabla_a(\rho\alpha) + \epsilon^{abc}\nabla_a\left(\frac{\rho B_b}{B^2}\right)(\nabla_c\psi) = 0 \tag{104}$$

Unfortunately, this relation shows that one should not expect to be able to completely determine α from a given ψ (or vice versa). To see this note that the first term in (104) is a directional derivative along B^i, while the second term is a scalar function (let us call it g). Suppose that we introduce a coordinate system $[\hat{e}^i_1, \hat{e}^i_2, \hat{e}^i_3]$ such that $\hat{e}^i_1$ is aligned with B^i. Then (104) can be written

$$B\frac{\partial(\rho\alpha)}{\partial x_1} + g(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0 \tag{105}$$

which integrates to

$$\alpha = -\frac{1}{\rho}\int \frac{g}{B}dx_1 + h(x_2, x_3) \tag{106}$$

where the function h is freely specifiable. From this simple demonstration we learn that we need to treat the functions α and ψ as (at least partially) independent.

A simple example of a case where α and ψ are independent is a uniform density fluid and a uniform force-free magnetic field. Since $\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_b B_c = 0$ for a force-free field and taking ρ and B^2 as constants, the constraint (104) collapses to

$$B^c\nabla_c(\rho\alpha) = 0 \tag{107}$$

from which it is clear that ψ remains freely specifiable.

Even though we have failed to obtain an explicit expression for the trivial displacements in terms of a single arbitrary function, we can proceed to write down the condition that determines a canonical displacement. Following the steps that led to (89) we arrive at

---

[5] In terms of the magnetic vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ we have

$$\mathbf{b} = \nabla\times\delta\mathbf{A} = \nabla\times(\xi\times\mathbf{B})$$

which gives $\delta\mathbf{A} = \xi\times\mathbf{B} + \nabla f$ where f represents the gauge degree of freedom. For a trivial displacement we have $\eta\times\mathbf{B} = \nabla\psi$ hence $\delta\mathbf{A} = \nabla(f+\psi)$. Hence, the trivials in the magnetic case generate a pure gauge transformation for the magnetic vector potential.

$$\left[\rho\alpha B^a - \psi\epsilon^{abc}\nabla_c\left(\frac{\rho B_b}{B^2}\right)\right]\Delta_{\hat{\xi}}u_a - \psi\left(\frac{\rho B_a}{B^2}\right)\Delta_{\hat{\xi}}\left(\frac{\omega^a}{\rho}\right) = 0 \tag{108}$$

Although this is not quite satisfactory, when combined with a solution to (104) it does allow us to confirm whether a proposed perturbation is canonical or not. In fact, we already know that a class of canonical perturbations are given by (95). It is easy to show that this class remains acceptable also in the magnetic case.

As an example of applying (108) let us work out another set of canonical displacements. We see from (108) that the problem simplifies if we take

$$B^a\Delta_{\hat{\xi}}u_a = 0 \tag{109}$$

To satisfy (108) we additionally need (since ψ is general)

$$\nabla_a\left(\frac{\rho\epsilon^{abc}B_c\Delta_{\hat{\xi}}u_b}{B^2}\right) = 0 \tag{110}$$

One can show that this is satisfied by

$$\Delta_{\hat{\xi}}u_a = \frac{1}{\rho}\left(B^c\nabla_a\chi_c - B^c\nabla_c\chi_a\right) \tag{111}$$

for a general χ_a.

5 STABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

Having at hand the canonical energy functional $E_c(\xi)$ and a properly formulated criterion in terms of canonical diplacements, we are ready to investigate the stability of various model systems. As discussed by Friedman & Schutz (1978a) this analysis can be based on either normal modes or canonical initial data. In the case of normal modes, i.e. solutions taking the form $\xi \sim e^{i\sigma t + im\varphi}$ (with m the usual integer eigenvalue associated with the separation of the azimuthal φ coordinate and σ the frequency) one can show that they generally correspond to canonical displacements. Although there are exceptions to this rule[6] an instability proof based on a mode-solution is generally valid (Friedman & Schutz 1978a).

Another important result that remains valid in the magnetic problem is the relation between the canonical energy and angular momentum

$$\frac{E_c}{J_c} = \omega_p \equiv -\frac{\sigma}{m} \tag{112}$$

This shows that the onset of instability can be deduced from a change in sign of the mode pattern speed ω_p. If we imagine the star spinning up, an initially counter-rotating mode with $J_c < 0$ becomes unstable (in the sense of having negative E_c) beyond a critical rotation frequency. The proof of the above relation proceeds exactly as in the non-magnetic problem since E_c and J_c have the same functional form when expressed in terms of the A and B operators of the master eqn. (22). What *is* different between the magnetic and non-magnetic problems is the intrinsic character of the modes themselves. A stability analysis for various classes of oscillation modes requires the determination of the associated displacement vectors. Solving for the oscillation modes of a rotating magnetised star is, however, a challenging problem. Once this problem is solved, the canonical energy formula can readily be used to test stability.

In absence of actual mode-solutions for a rotating magnetic star, we can make progress by discussing various classes of initial data. This will provide some insight into the role of the magnetic field. Let us start by extending the demonstration that a rotating star is generically unstable due to the emission of radiation. In their discussion of the secular instability of (isentropic) fluids coupled to gravitational radiation, Friedman & Schutz (1978b) chose the following canonical data (in cylidrical coordinates ϖ, z, φ),

$$\begin{align} \hat{\xi}^a &= (\mu\delta^a_\varphi + \nu^a)e^{im\varphi} \tag{113}\\ \Delta_{\hat{\xi}}u_a &= \nabla_a f \quad \Rightarrow \quad \partial_t\hat{\xi}_a = \nabla_a f - u^b(\nabla_b\hat{\xi}_a + \nabla_a\hat{\xi}_b) \tag{114}\end{align}$$

with $f = \lambda e^{im\varphi}$. Given this choice we find,

$$\begin{align} \nabla_b\xi^a &= e^{im\varphi}\left[im\delta^\varphi_b(\mu\delta^a_\varphi + \nu^a) + \delta^a_\varphi\nabla_b\mu + \nabla_b\nu^a + \mu\left(\frac{1}{\varpi}\delta^a_\varphi\delta^\varpi_b - \varpi\delta^a_\varpi\delta^\varphi_b\right)\right] \tag{115}\\ \nabla_a\xi^a &= e^{im\varphi}(im\mu + \nabla_k\nu^k) \tag{116}\\ u^b\nabla_b\xi^a &= e^{im\varphi}u^\varphi\left[im(\mu\delta^a_\varphi + \nu^a) - \mu\varpi\delta^a_\varpi + \frac{1}{\varpi}\nu^\varpi\delta^a_\varphi\right] \tag{117}\end{align}$$

---

[6] In the case of a fluid configuration with purely azimuthal flow $u^\varphi = \Omega(\varpi)$ a normal mode can belong to the family of trivials if it is corotating with the background flow, i.e $\sigma = -m\Omega$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
|u^b\nabla_b\xi^a|^2 &= (u^\varphi)^2\left[m^2(\varpi^2\mu\mu^* + \nu^a\nu^*_a) + 2im\varpi(\mu\nu^*_\varpi - \mu^*\nu_\varpi) + \nu^\varpi\nu^*_\varpi + \varpi^2\mu\mu^*\right] && (118)\\
|\partial_t\xi^a|^2 &= m^2\left[\frac{1}{\varpi^2}\lambda\lambda^* + (u^\varphi)^2(4\varpi^2\mu\mu^* + XX^* + ZZ^*) - 2u^\varphi(\mu\lambda^* + \mu^*\lambda)\right] && (119)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $Z = \nu^z$ and $X = \nu^\varpi$. The resulting expression for the perfect fluid canonical energy, minimised with respect to λ, is

$$
E_c \leq \frac{1}{2}m^2\int dV\rho(c_s^2 - \varpi^2\Omega^2)\mu\mu^* + mk_1 + k_2 \qquad (120)
$$

where $c_s^2 = \gamma p/\rho$ is the sound speed and the functions k_1 and k_2 are independent of m. Since $c_s \to 0$ near the surface of the star, the energy functional becomes generically negative in the 'multiarm' limit, $m \gg 1$. Therefore, we can find physically acceptable perturbations that make *all* rotating fluid stars unstable to gravitational radiation.

We can use the same initial data, eqns. (113) & (114), in the full MHD canonical energy (77). In addition to (115)-(119) we then need the magnetic terms,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|B^c\nabla_c\xi^a|^2 &= m^2(B^\varphi)^2(\varpi^2\mu\mu^* + XX^* + ZZ^*) && (121)\\
B^cRe[(\nabla_a\xi^a)^2B_b\nabla_c\xi^b] &= m^2B^\varphi\left\{\varpi^2\mu\mu^*B^\varphi + Re\left[\mu(B^\varpi X + B^zZ)\right]\right\} && (122)
\end{aligned}
$$

This leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_c \quad \leq \quad & \frac{1}{2}m^2\int dV\rho\left\{\mu\mu^*\left(c_s^2 - \varpi^2\Omega^2 + \frac{B_p^2}{4\pi\rho}\right) + \frac{(B^\varphi)^2}{4\pi\rho}(XX^* + ZZ^*)\right.\\
& \left. -\frac{B^\varphi}{4\pi\rho}\left[B^\varpi(\mu^*X + \mu X^*) + B^z(\mu^*Z + \mu Z^*)\right]\right\} + mk_1 + k_2 \qquad (123)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $B_p^2 = (B^\varpi)^2 + (B^z)^2$. Since the first two magnetic terms are positive definite they always play a stabilising role. Meanwhile, the third magnetic term can be either positive or negative. Hence, it could potentially destabilise the system. It should be noted that this term vanishes when the magnetic field is either purely poloidal ($B^\varphi = 0$) or purely toroidal ($B^\varpi = B^z = 0$). It should, however, be present for all realistic neutron star field configurations. In general the (negative) rotation term is the main destabilising factor. The main stabilising term is $\gamma p/\rho$ which is a surrogate for the star's gravitational potential energy. This energy is far greater than the energy stored in the magnetic field and, consequently, provided we are not too close to the surface, the sound speed term will dominate over any magnetic term (assuming components for the displacement vector μ, X, Z of roughly the same order of magnitude). Hence, one would expect the instability region to shift only slightly in the magnetic case. If a non-magnetic star is unstable at a given rotation rate for $m \gg 1$ then it is very likely that the same is true for the corresponding magnetic star.

To conclude the discussion, let us consider a specific case inspired by the instability of the inertial r-modes in a rotating perfect fluid star (Andersson 1998; Friedman & Morsink 1998). Inertial modes are incompressible to leading order in the slow-rotation expansion. This means that it is interesting to consider displacements for which $\nabla_i\hat{\xi}^i = 0$. In this case, the canonical energy simplifies considerably. Let us, for the sake of the argument, assume an incompressible mode-solution of form (113) with time-dependence represented by a frequency σ (although it should be pointed out that it is not at all clear that such a solution actually exists). Then, further restricting the analysis to a purely azimuthal magnetic field, we find in the $m \gg 1$ limit,

$$
E_c \leq \frac{1}{2}\int dV\rho\left[(g_{\varphi\varphi}\mu\mu^* + \nu^b\nu_b^*)\left(\sigma^2 - m^2\Omega^2 + m^2\frac{(B^\varphi)^2}{4\pi\rho}\right)\right] + mk_1 + k_2 \qquad (124)
$$

This result is interesting because it suggests that in order for the mode to have a chance of becoming unstable the star's rotational frequency must first dominate over the Alfvén frequency of the background magnetic field. This is a strong hint that the instability of (say) the r-modes may be significantly affected by the presence of a magnetic field. This adds further complexity to the interesting issues discussed by Rezzolla et al. (2001a,b). The problem of radiation driven instabilities in magnetic stars undoubtedly warrants further investigation.

6 CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we have presented a framework for analysing the stability properties of a stationary and axisymmetric, infinitely conducting perfect fluid configuration threaded by a magnetic field and surrounded by vacuum. We have developed a Lagrangian perturbation approach which enables us to formulate a rigorous stability criterion based on the canonical energy. For any choice of initial data, represented by the displacement vector and its time derivative $\{\xi, \partial_t\xi\}$, the sign of the canonical energy determines whether the configuration is stable or not at the linear perturbation level.

Our analysis provides the first complete description of the stability problem for a rotating magnetic star. We extended previous results for rotating stars by allowing for the presence of an exterior vacuum field. We also discussed (for the first time in this context) the complications associated with the so-called 'trivial' fluid displacements, which do not represent true physical perturbations. In order for the stability criterion to make sense one has to isolate these trivials and consider only the physical 'canonical' displacements. We discussed this problem and formulated a condition which must be satisfied by all canonical displacements. Having obtained a well-defined stability criterion we provided two examples that indicate that the magnetic field tends to stabilise radiation driven instabilities.

To make further progress we need to calculate explicit mode-solutions for a rotating magnetic system. Once such modes have been obtained the canonical energy formulated in this paper can be used to assess their stability. Of course, the calculation of oscillation modes of a magnetic star is a far from trivial problem that sets a severe challenge for future efforts in this area. On the other hand, strong motivation for such work is provided by increasingly detailed observations of for example magnetar flares and associated quasiperiodic oscillations.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF HERMITICITY OF THE C OPERATOR

In this Appendix we describe the various steps involved in proving the Hermiticity of the C operator. We start from (see the main text)

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^a C[\xi_a] &= \rho\eta^a(u^b\nabla_b)^2\xi_a - \eta^a\nabla_b(\rho\xi^b)(\nabla_a\Phi + u^c\nabla_c u_a) + \rho\eta^a\nabla_a\delta\Phi + \eta^a\nabla_a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(b^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_cb_a) - \rho\eta^a\xi^c\nabla_c(u^b\nabla_bu_a)\end{aligned}\tag{A1}$$

or,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^a C[\xi_a] &= \nabla_a\left[\eta^a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right)\right] + \rho\eta^a(u^b\nabla_b)^2\xi_a - \eta^a\nabla_b(\rho\xi^b)(\nabla_a\Phi + u^c\nabla_cu_a) + \rho\eta^a\nabla_a\delta\Phi\\ &\quad -\nabla_a\eta^a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(b^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_cb_a) - \rho\eta^a\xi^c\nabla_c(u^b\nabla_bu_a)\end{aligned}\tag{A2}$$

Our task is to manipulate $\eta^a C[\xi_a]$ to make it symmetric with respect to η^a and ξ^a.

Let us first study separately the magnetic 'tension' term,

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(b^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_cb_a) &= \frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(\xi^b\nabla_bB^c\nabla_cB_a - B^b\nabla_b\xi^c\nabla_cB_a + \nabla_b\xi^bB^c\nabla_cB_a) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_c(\eta^aB^cb_a)\\ &\quad +\frac{1}{4\pi}B^c\nabla_c\eta^a(-\nabla_b\xi^bB_a - \xi^b\nabla_bB_a + B^b\nabla_b\xi_a)\\[6pt] &= -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_c(\eta^aB^cb_a) + \frac{1}{4\pi}B^cB^b\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a - \frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_b\xi^bB^c(B_a\nabla_c\eta^a - \eta^a\nabla_cB_a)\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4\pi}(-\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_bB^c\nabla_cB_a + \eta^aB^b\nabla_b\xi^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_c\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_bB_a)\end{aligned}\tag{A3}$$

And since,

$$\eta^aB^b\nabla_b\xi^c\nabla_cB_a = \nabla_b(\eta^aB^b\xi^c\nabla_cB_a) - \nabla_b\eta^aB^b\xi^c\nabla_cB_a - \eta^a\xi^cB^b\nabla_b\nabla_cB_a\tag{A4}$$

we have,

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(b^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_cb_a) &= -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_c(\eta^aB^cb_a + \eta^aB^c\xi^b\nabla_bB_a) + \frac{1}{4\pi}B^cB^b\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_b\xi^bB^c(B_a\nabla_c\eta^a - \eta^a\nabla_cB_a) + \frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_b(B^c\nabla_cB_a)\end{aligned}\tag{A5}$$

Using once the background Euler equation in the last term, we arrive at,

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^a(b^c\nabla_cB_a + B^c\nabla_cb_a) &= -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_c(\eta^aB^cb_a + \eta^aB^c\xi^b\nabla_bB_a) + \frac{1}{4\pi}B^bB^c\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a\\ &\quad -\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_b\xi^bB^c(B_a\nabla_c\eta^a - \eta^a\nabla_cB_a) + \eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b\left(p + \frac{B^2}{8\pi}\right)\\ &\quad +\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_b[\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a + \nabla_a\Phi)]\end{aligned}\tag{A6}$$

Moreover, we have for the total pressure term,

$$\begin{aligned}-\nabla_a\eta^a\left(\delta p + \frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right) &= \nabla_a\eta^a(\gamma p\nabla_b\xi^b + \xi^b\nabla_bp) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_a\eta^aB_c(-\nabla_b\xi^bB^c - \xi^b\nabla_bB^c + B^b\nabla_b\xi^c)\\ &= \nabla_a\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b(\gamma p + B^2/4\pi) + \nabla_a\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_b(p + B^2/8\pi) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_a\eta^aB^b\nabla_b\xi^cB_c\end{aligned}\tag{A7}$$

Using once more the background Euler equation in the second term we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}-\nabla_a\eta^a\left(\delta p+\frac{1}{4\pi}b^cB_c\right) &= \nabla_a\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b(\gamma p+B^2/4\pi)-\rho\nabla_a\eta^a\xi^b(\nabla_b\Phi+u^c\nabla_c u_b)\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{4\pi}\nabla_a\eta^aB^c(\xi^b\nabla_cB_b-\nabla_c\xi^bB_b)\end{aligned}\tag{A8}$$

Collecting the above results and returning to the full expression,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^aC[\xi_a] &= \nabla_a\left[\eta^a\left(\delta p+\frac{1}{4\pi}B^cb_c\right)-\frac{1}{4\pi}(\eta^cB^ab_c+\eta^cB^a\xi^b\nabla_bB_c)\right]+\frac{1}{4\pi}B^bB^c\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a\\ &\quad+\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b(p+B^2/8\pi)+\nabla_a\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b(\gamma p+B^2/4\pi)+\rho\eta^a\nabla_a\delta\Phi\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{4\pi}\left[\nabla_a\eta^aB^c(\xi^b\nabla_cB_b-\nabla_c\xi^bB_b)-\nabla_b\xi^bB^c(B_a\nabla_c\eta^a-\eta^a\nabla_cB_a)\right]-\eta^a\nabla_b(\rho\xi^b)(\nabla_a\Phi+u^c\nabla_cu_a)\\ &\quad-\rho\eta^a\xi^c\nabla_c(u^b\nabla_bu_a)+\rho\eta^a(u^b\nabla_b)^2\xi_a+\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_b[\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a+\nabla_a\Phi)]-\rho\nabla_a\eta^a\xi^b(\nabla_b\Phi+u^c\nabla_cu_b)\end{aligned}\tag{A9}$$

The remaining non-symmetric terms (apart from the first surface term) are the last five terms. Denoting them collectively as R we have,

$$\begin{aligned}R &= -\eta^a\nabla_b(\rho\xi^b)(\nabla_a\Phi+u^c\nabla_cu_a)-\rho\eta^a\xi^c\nabla_c(u^b\nabla_bu_a)+\rho\eta^a(u^b\nabla_b)^2\xi_a\\ &\quad+\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_b[\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a+\nabla_a\Phi)]-\rho\nabla_a\eta^a\xi^b(\nabla_b\Phi+u^c\nabla_cu_b)\end{aligned}\tag{A10}$$

Differentiating by parts the fourth term we find,

$$R=-\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a+\nabla_a\Phi)(\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b+\xi^a\nabla_b\eta^b)+\rho\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b\Phi+\rho\eta^au^b\nabla_b(u^c\nabla_c\xi^a)\tag{A11}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho\eta^au^b\nabla_b(u^c\nabla_c\xi^a) &= \rho\eta^au^b\nabla_bu^c\nabla_c\xi_a+\rho\eta^au^bu^c\nabla_b\nabla_c\xi_a\\ &= \nabla_b(\rho\eta^au^bu^c\nabla_c\xi_a)-\rho\nabla_b\eta^au^bu^c\nabla_c\xi_a-\eta^au^c\nabla_c\xi_a(u^b\nabla_b\rho+\rho\nabla_bu^b)\end{aligned}\tag{A12}$$

The last term vanishes due to the background continuity equation so eventually we are left with,

$$\begin{aligned}R &= \nabla_b(\rho\eta^au^bu^c\nabla_c\xi_a)-\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a+\nabla_a\Phi)(\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b+\xi^a\nabla_b\eta^b)\\ &\quad+\rho\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b\Phi-\rho u^cu^b\nabla_b\eta^a\nabla_c\xi_a\end{aligned}\tag{A13}$$

Written in this form, R contains only surface and symmetric terms. The final step is to symmetrise the gravitational potential term $\rho\,\eta^a\nabla_a\delta\Phi$ in eqn. (A9). From Ref. Friedman & Schutz (1978a) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho\,\eta^a\nabla_a\delta\Phi &= \nabla_a(\rho\eta^a\delta_\xi\Phi)+\delta_\eta\rho\delta_\xi\Phi\\ &= \nabla_a(\rho\eta^a\delta_\xi\Phi)+\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^2\delta_\eta\Phi\delta_\xi\Phi\\ &= \nabla_a\left[\delta_\xi\Phi\left(\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^a\delta_\eta\Phi+\rho\eta^a\right)\right]-\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^b\delta_\eta\Phi\nabla_b\delta_\xi\Phi\end{aligned}\tag{A14}$$

Collecting all the results we finally obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^aC[\xi_a] &= \nabla_a\left[\eta^a(\delta p+B^cb_c/4\pi)-\frac{1}{4\pi}\eta^c(B^ab_c+B^a\xi^b\nabla_bB_c)+\rho\eta^bu^au^c\nabla_c\xi_b+\delta_\xi\Phi\left(\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^a\delta_\eta\Phi+\rho\eta^a\right)\right]\\ &\quad-\frac{1}{4\pi G}\nabla^b\delta_\eta\Phi\nabla_b\delta_\xi\Phi+\frac{1}{4\pi}B^bB^c\nabla_c\eta^a\nabla_b\xi_a+\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b(p+B^2/8\pi)+\nabla_a\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b(\gamma p+B^2/4\pi)\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{4\pi}[\nabla_a\eta^aB^c(\xi^b\nabla_cB_b-\nabla_c\xi^bB_b)+\nabla_b\xi^bB^c(\eta^a\nabla_cB_a-\nabla_c\eta^aB_a)]\\ &\quad-\rho(u^c\nabla_cu_a+\nabla_a\Phi)(\eta^a\nabla_b\xi^b+\xi^a\nabla_b\eta^b)+\rho\eta^a\xi^b\nabla_a\nabla_b\Phi-\rho u^cu^b\nabla_b\eta^a\nabla_c\xi_a\end{aligned}\tag{A15}$$

This is eqn. (28) of the main text.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by PPARC through grant number PPA/G/S/2002/00038. NA acknowledges support from PPARC via Senior Research Fellowship no PP/C505791/1. We would also like to thank the anonymous referee for his/her constructive criticism that led to significant improvements of the paper.

REFERENCES

Andersson, N., 1998, Ap. J. **502**, 708

Andersson, N., 2003, Class. Quantum. Grav. **20** R105

Andersson, N., Comer, G.L., Grosart, K., 2004 MNRAS **355** 918

Andersson, N., and G.L. Comer, 2006, to appear in Living Reviews in Relativity, preprint gr-qc/0605010

Bernstein, I., E.A. Frieman, M.D. Kruskal and R.M. Kulsrud, 1958, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **244**, 17

Chandrasekhar, S., 1961, *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic stability* (Oxford University Press)

Friedman, J.L., 1978, Commun. Math. Phys. **62** 247

Friedman, J.L., and S.M. Morsink, 1998, Ap. J. **502**, 714

Friedman, J.L., and B.F. Schutz, 1978a, Ap. J. **221**, 937

Friedman, J.L., and B. F. Schutz, 1978b, Ap. J. **222**, 281

Frieman, E., and M. Rotenberg, 1960, Rev. Mod. Phys. **32**, 898

Kovetz, A., 1966, Ap. J. **146**, 462

Lynden-Bell, D., and J.P. Ostriker, 1967, MNRAS **136**, 293

Mestel, L., 2003, *Stellar Magnetism* (Oxford University Press)

Rezzolla, L., Lamb, F.K., Markovic, D., Shapiro, S.L., 2001 Phys. Rev. D **64**, 104013

Rezzolla, L., Lamb, F.K., Markovic, D., Shapiro, S.L., 2001 Phys. Rev. D **64**, 104014

Roberts, R.H., 1967, *An Introduction to Magnetohydrodynamics*, (Longmans, London)